UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

CTK MARKETING, LLC,

Plaintiff,

- against -

TRISTAR PRODUCTS, INC., KISHORE L. MIRCHANDANI, IMEDIA BRANDS, INC.,

Defendants.

ORDER

22-cv-7998 (ER)

RAMOS, D.J.:

Pending before the Court are motions to dismiss the Second Amended Complaint filed by each of the three defendants. Docs. 26, 27, 28.

On July 12, 2023, counsel for iMedia Brands, Inc. ("iMedia") informed the Court that it commenced Chapter 11 bankruptcy proceedings in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware. Doc. 34. Accordingly, pursuant to Section 362 of the Bankruptcy Code, the case was automatically stayed as to iMedia. *Id.* By July 20, 2023, the parties are directed to notify the Court in writing whether the case and pending motions should be stayed as to all parties.

Additionally, the Court notes that CTK Marketing failed to oppose the motion to dismiss filed by individual defendant Kishore L. Mirchandani. CTK Marketing indicated that it did not do so because "Defendant Keith Mirchandani [filed his motion] . . . despite not being served[,] and it is respectfully submitted [that] his motion is therefore procedurally defective." Doc. 30 at 4 n.1. In response, Counsel for Tristar and Mirchandani requested that the Court "dismiss all causes of action against Mr. Mirchandani personally with prejudice, with leave to file a request

to shift fees with respect to the preparation of Mr. Mirchandani's Motion to Dismiss." Doc. 33 at

4 n.1.

Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that "[i]f a defendant is not

served within 90 days after the complaint is filed, the court—on motion or on its own after notice

to the plaintiff—must dismiss the action without prejudice against that defendant or order that

service be made within a specified time." Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m) (emphasis added). In its letter to

the Court, CTK Marketing is directed to indicate why dismissal as to Mirchandani is not

appropriate at this juncture. CTK Marketing shall address the argument that dismissal should be

with prejudice. See Doc. 33 at 4 n.1.

It is SO ORDERED.

Dated:

July 13, 2023

New York, New York

EDGARDO RAMOS, U.S.D.J.

2